

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

This amendment is provided in response to the Final Office Action mailed July 27, 2005. As shown above claims 1, 2, 16 and 25 are amended herein, and claims 5-8, 29-31 and 36 are canceled. Claims 1-4 and 9-28, and 32-35, and 37-48 remain pending in this action.

The 7/27/05 Office Action rejected the previously pending claims as being anticipated by Polizzi et al. (US 6,643,661).

It is respectfully submitted that the present amendment to claim 1, which is described in more detail below, is provided to more clearly distinguish elements of an embodiment of the present invention. However, the present amendment is submitted without prejudice to pursuing the previously pending claims through a continuation case or other alternatives. Further, the present amendment should not be taken as an admission that the Polizzi et al. reference is prior art to the present application.

The Pending Claims

As shown above, claim 1 has been amended to specify that the bus includes a channel manager component which provides for at least three different types of channels. Additionally, claim 1 recites that the bus includes a service discovery component that identifies different types of interfaces which correspond to the different service providers. Further, claim 1 specifies that there is a service provider container coupled to the bus, and that the service provider container includes a service provider application. The service provider container further includes an interaction broker component which includes a request broker component, an event handler component and a stream handler component.

It is respectfully submitted that as discussed in more detail below there does not appear to any teaching in Polizzi which suggests providing a container with a service provider application, and that the container then provides for three different types of interfaces for the service provider application, and in combination with the container and the multiple interfaces, a bus is provided which then provides for three different types of channels for communication between various modules, and also providing the bus with a service discovery component which identifies the different types of interfaces which correspond to the plurality of different service providers.

Specifically, the system of claim 1 provides that the service provider container includes an interaction broker component, and the interaction broker component includes a request broker component, an event handler component, and a stream handler component. Using each of its different broker components (request broker, event handler and stream handler) the interaction broker invokes said service provider application, and the invocation is based on either the service request, the events, or the stream received from the bus. An important aspect of this system is that a single service provider application can be utilized with the different types of data interfaces (service request, stream, or event) and the service container invokes the service application as per the needed type of interface.

Additionally, the bus plays an integral role in the computing system in that it provides a service discovery component which identifies the different interfaces for the plurality of service providers. The bus also provides a channel manager component which provides different types of channels for communication, and these different channels correspond to different interfaces which are available for the application.

The Teaching of Polizzi et al.

The 7/27/05 Office Action refers to numerous paragraphs of Polizzi et al. in rejecting the previously pending claims. It is respectfully submitted that a careful review of Polizzi et al. clearly shows that Polizzi et al. do not anticipate or suggest pending claim 1 or its dependent claims.

For example, the 7/27/05 Office Action refers to col. 7: lines 49-64 for its teaching regarding a channel. This teaching from Polizzi refers to a channel which is very different than the channel element recited in pending claim 1. The channel of Polizzi describes a search which was constructed by a user. According to Polizzi this search is stored for processing at a later date. The user can go back and update the channel, or update the search at a later date. According to Polizzi these channels can be incorporated into portal pages and they can be shared with other users. The user can share these channels with other users. Polizzi et al. col. 7: lines 49-64.

A review of the teaching of Polizzi clearly establishes that Polizzi does not provide for a bus with a channel manager which provides for at least three different types of channels for

communication, where these different channels include a first channel for an operation interface; and a second channel for an event interface; and a third channel for a stream interface.

Not only does Polizzi not disclose the type of bus/channel manager/channel arrangement as recited by claim 1, numerous other elements of claim 1 also appear to be lacking from the teaching of Polizzi. For example, it should be noted that the bus of claim 1 also includes a service discovery component which identifies the plurality of different types of interfaces (these are the different interfaces which correspond to the different types of channels). It is respectfully submitted that this type of element also appears to be lacking in Polizzi. Additionally, the service container recited by claim 1 operates to provide for three types of interfaces (operation interface, event interface, and stream interface). These three interfaces correspond to the different channel types provided for by the channel manager of the bus. It is respectfully submitted that the teaching of Polizzi does not in any way suggest the system of claim 1.

Indeed it should be noted that Polizzi is directed to a system for implementing personalized portal pages on which searches can be entered and search reports can be generated. Polizzi does not, however, provide for the use of various different channels, containers, and interfaces, as recited by claim 1. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that claim 1 and its dependent claims are patentable over the references.

Conclusion

For the reasons set forth above, it is believed that all claims present in this application are patentably distinguished over the references. Therefore, reconsideration is respectfully requested, and it is requested that this application be passed to allowance.


The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any deficiency in the fees filed, asserted to be filed or which should have been filed herewith (or with any paper hereafter

filed in this application by this firm) to our Deposit Account No. 50-2001 under Order No. SCHB-3500. **A duplicate copy of the transmittal cover sheet attached to this Response is provided.**

Respectfully submitted,

FARELLA BRAUN + MARTEL LLP

Dated: November 22, 2005

By: 
Brian J. Keating
Reg. No. 39,520

Attorneys for Applicant(s)